## "whether a reasonable person with knowledge of all the facts would conclude that the judge's impartiality might be questioned." *United States v. Holland*, 519 F.2d 909, 913 (9th Cir. 2008). Plaintiff has not demonstrated any such basis for recusal. He explains that he believes that the undersigned is biased due to a purported refusal to apply the correct legal standard and prematurely recommending dismissal. Disagreement with unfavorable rulings is not a valid basis for recusal. Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) (holding that judicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a recusal motion based on bias or impartiality); *United* States v. Johnson, 610 F.3d 1138, 1147-48 (9th Cir. 2010) (same). Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for recusal, ECF No. 6, is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 19, 2025 JEREMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Document 9

Filed 05/19/25

Page 2 of 2

Case 2:25-cv-01083-TLN-JDP